

straightforward what it would do. It restricts the ability of the Government to borrow money. It requires in its one single absolutely dispositive section, it says, you must have a three-fifths majority in order to raise the amount of money, the debt ceiling on what, in order to raise the amount of money that the United States can borrow. The limit on that amount of money, in order to raise the limit on the amount of money we can borrow, you have to have a three-fifths majority. That is precisely the kind of restriction that Thomas Jefferson was talking about in 1789.

And what did the Senate do? Well, one Senator from the State of Florida who had personally campaigned on a promise to vote in favor of a balanced budget amendment voted against it, campaigned not more than 5 months ago on that promise, not more than 4 months ago on that promise, said in a solemn promise to the people that she was wanting to represent, I am going to vote for a balanced budget amendment. And then come yesterday, she voted against it. And what was the excuse given by her and by other Members of the other body? The excuse given was that somehow this would possibly, this could somehow have an impact on Social Security.

Well, A, that is not true. And B, where were those people in August of 1993, when they voted to cut Social Security by \$25 billion and every single Republican in the Senate and every single Republican in the House of Representatives voted against that? But they voted to increase or to tax Social Security and cut Social Security payments to senior citizens \$25 billion. Where were they then?

And then to say, well, this is just, this is just a hidden ploy to make it possible to cut Social Security. It is a lie. They know it is a lie. It is a smoke screen.

What is the smoke screen for? I will tell you what the smoke screen is for. It is for those people who truly believe that the Federal Government can solve all our problems. If you believe that the Federal Government can solve all of our problems through more spending, through bigger spending programs, through throwing more money at these problems, through hiring more Federal bureaucrats to do it, then you ought to be opposed to a balanced budget amendment. And if you are going to be truthful about it and if you are going to be honest about it, then that is what you will tell people, that is the way that you will explain it.

The smoke screen is Social Security recipients, when every single one of them voted to cut Social Security.

#### THE FEDERAL DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OXLEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I was going to stand up here today and talk about the fact that over the last 16 years I have been trying to enact legislation dealing with regulatory reform that would give back property rights to the people of this country, but I was so angered this morning when I woke up about 6 a.m. in the morning and I was watching CNN. I saw the President and his press secretary talking about how they had killed the balanced budget amendment. And how they now could get down to the serious business of balancing the budget over the next 7 years.

I have never been so mad in my life. I have a chart here, which says, "deficit projections and debt accumulation." This was President Clinton's budget as he offered it last year. And as you can see, he projected a deficit in 1995 of \$165 billion, and it grew all the way over so that at the end of 5 years, there is an accumulation of \$894 billion in new accumulated debt to go to the \$4.5 trillion we already have.

This year, in January, he just gave us his new 5-year projection. This is just a year later. And what does this show? It shows in 1995, \$193 billion in accumulated debt in just this first year. That is 30 billion higher than last year. And if you look at 1996, it goes from \$170 billion deficit to \$197 billion and so on over to the end of the 5-year period.

So what has he done? He has increased the national debt by almost a trillion dollars over the next 5 years. And they talk about wanting to balance the budget.

The one thing that is said is true, and that is that Congress just does not have the guts to balance the budget themselves. That is too bad. And, therefore, they do need that prodding. That is what those five Senators that promised to vote for a balanced budget amendment last year during their election said that needed to happen. Yet today they turned around and voted "no."

You know, Mr. Speaker, I introduced a budget last year. It was an alternative to both the Democrat and Republican budgets. And if you look at this bottom figure, we accumulated, instead of a trillion dollars over 5 years, we accumulated only \$252 billion. But the interesting thing is that every single year the deficit dramatically dropped from \$132 billion the first year down to \$69 billion the second year, \$47 billion the third year, \$12 billion the fourth year, and a surplus of \$8 billion in the fifth year.

You say, how did you do that? Because all of the pundits say, you cannot do that without raising taxes. You cannot do that without cutting Social Security. You cannot do that without cutting into contractual obligations to veterans.

Well, my colleagues, we did that. How did we do it. We did it by eliminating 150 programs like the Interstate Commerce Commission, that is totally wasteful. We privatized 125 government agencies, like the Federal Aviation Ad-

ministration. We consolidated 35 government functions like the Bureau of Indian Affairs that has been there for 70 years and does nothing today. And downsized the Department of Education from 5,000 employees down to an office of only 500. We abolished the Department of Energy, which has not produced a gallon of gasoline or a quart of oil, we cut out 16,000 employees there and let the free market system work.

We converted the Department of Commerce from an overblown department of 36,000 employees down to only 3,000 and made them a consultative body to business and industry instead of this huge bureaucratic department. And then we means tested every single Federal program, including school lunch programs.

People say, Republicans want to do away with school lunch programs. We do not want to do away with school lunch programs. What we want to do is make Members of Congress ineligible because of their total wages. We make \$129,000 or \$130,000 a year. Why should the Government be subsidizing my children's school lunches? They should not, because we cannot afford it. And we means test that with people with incomes over \$50,000.

Medicare, people with incomes of over \$100,000 or \$200,000 are being subsidized by the Federal Government for their health care. That is all well and good, I suppose, if you can afford it. But we do not have the money. And we means test everything else across the board.

Do you know what that did? That gave us an \$800 billion savings over 5 years, and we balanced the budget without hurting people, by truly taking care of the needy.

It can be done, but we cannot do it the way this president is trying to do it.

#### HARVEST OF TREES ON FEDERAL LANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DICKS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House Committee on Appropriations took very dramatic action to deal with a very serious environmental problem in our country. Yesterday the House Committee on Appropriations directed the Forest Service to double their salvage program from approximately 1.5 billion board feet up to 3 billion board feet over the next 2 years. What that will do in essence will be to expand this program that is used to go out and take down dead, dying, diseased, bug-infested, and burnt trees that are going to rot and will be of no use to us over the next 2½ years.

What we said is, this is an emergency. We need to go out and do a good

job for the American people, allow our foresters to go out and gather in those burnt, bug-infested trees. And that we could, if we did this, probably bring in about a billion dollars over the next 2 years in additional revenues to the treasury.

Also we would be protecting the forest health. It is clear in my mind and all the experts say this, if we do not get rid of these dead and dying trees, then we are going to be faced with the problem of increased forest fires.

Last year we spent in fighting forest fires in the west \$1 billion. So we passed this emergency program yesterday and in it we created expedited procedures. We said that for the next 2 years, every sale will have to have an environmental assessment. There will have to be a biological opinion done, in which you look at the effect on endangered species, and if an agency, the Forest Service or the BLM are arbitrary and capricious, you can go into Federal court and stop that sale, that there will also be a period of time for administrative review. So we have created expedited judicial procedures and expedited environmental review, because if we do not act, if we do not get those trees while we can, we are going to lose this potential revenue to the Federal taxpayers.

Now, how much salvage is out there in the entire country? The Forest Service estimates that there is somewhere between 18- and 21-billion-board feet of this salvage that is out there. And today our lumber mills need saw logs. Our pulp and paper mills need chips. We have seen a dramatic reduction in harvesting of our Federal forest lands. And because of that, our mills are going out of business, particularly in the Pacific Northwest.

So I hope that the American taxpayers and the American people will support the Committee on Appropriations, will support the Taylor-Dicks amendment, which will allow this to happen.

I am glad that we had a bipartisan approach to this. The gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman TAYLOR, is a forester. He knows a lot about these matters. I have been working on these issues and trying to urge additional salvage for many, many years.

I think this is a win-win. We can protect the forest health by getting rid of these dead and dying trees, because if we do not do it, if we leave it out there, then we will have increased forest fires next year and we will have to spend billions more fighting the fires out in the west.

We also, by the way, the home builders of our country support this, because the cost of lumber in an ordinary \$135,000 has gone up by \$5,000 a house, because of the shortage of lumber.

This will give additional lumber supply and hopefully will reduce those prices. So it has a positive effect on housing as well.

I regret that we have to take this emergency step. I regret that we had to

do this in the Committee on Appropriations. But I want you to know that the chairman of the Committee on Resources and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the two committees with authorizing jurisdiction, approved this measure, because they recognize the emergency.

In my own State of Washington, we have seen a dramatic reduction in timber harvesting of our Federal lands over the last several years. Many of the people who I grew up with, went to school with, have lost their jobs, have gone into bankruptcy because they used to depend on logs off our Federal lands and they cannot get them any longer.

And they come to me and say, "Norm, can't we please have those dead and dying trees, the ones that are burnt, that are going to rot and we can't use them after two or three years? Can't we go out there and get them?"

So this amendment will allow that to happen, and I hope when it comes to the floor that we will have unanimous support, as we did in the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

□ 1530

#### AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OXLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. TUCKER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time today in this special order to talk about an issue that is admittedly controversial but an issue that is going to be important to the well-being and the future of this country. That is, the issue of affirmation action.

This issue is about the fundamental right of minorities and women to participate in this society on every level without arbitrary and capricious barriers.

Mr. Speaker, affirmative action is a sledge hammer, created by this society, to smash the concrete barriers to opportunity. It was designed and implemented to erode the dual barriers of racism and sexism in this country, be it individual or institutional—intended or unintended. Mr. Speaker, throughout the history of this country, African-Americans have experienced the most humiliating and dehumanizing treatment every perpetrated on any group of people save the Native American.

The freedom of women and minorities to participate has been both a recent phenomenon and more importantly, a direct result of the Suffrage Movement, the Civil Rights Movement, the Voting Rights Act and just as importantly—affirmative action. While I know support for affirmative action

has dwindled, its necessity is as apparent as ever before.

I am here today to tell those Americans who would dismantle affirmative action and undermine the gains of minorities and women that their efforts will not succeed.

Before the discussion can begin on the dismantlement of a policy, before attempts can be made to reverse the gains made by people in the areas of diversity, access and inclusion, before America can even think about having race and gender neutral laws, America must answer the question—have we really removed race and gender bias? Every statistic seems to suggest that we have not.

Let me begin by defining what affirmative action is and how it came to be.

Affirmative action is a term that first appeared in the text of the 1935 Wagner Act.

Under the Wagner Act, employers who were found to have intentionally engaged in unfair labor practices against union organizers and members had to take "affirmative action, including reinstatement of employees."

In 1941, prior to U.S. entry into World War II, President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued Executive Order 8802 affirming that it was U.S. policy "To encourage full participation in the national defense program by all citizens of the United States, regardless of race, creed, color or national origin."

Further, the order required that all future Defense contracts negotiated by the U.S. Government contain a non-discrimination clause.

Executive orders for the next 20 years built upon the nondiscrimination mandate of Executive Order 8802. These orders reaffirmed the Federal Government's commitment to equal opportunity and reorganized the administrative structures to implement non-discrimination policies in Federal employment under Government contract.

In 1961 President Kennedy issued Executive Order 10925 which endorsed a more proactive approach to equal opportunity and created the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

The committee was directed "to consider and recommend additional affirmative steps which should be taken by executive departments and agencies to realize more fully the national policy of nondiscrimination within the executive branch of the Federal Government. The order required that Government contractors agree not to engage in employment discrimination based on race, creed, color, or national origin, and agree to "Take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employers are treated during employment" without regard to these characteristics.

Not until the Civil Rights Act of 1964 did the U.S. House of Representatives see fit to apply affirmative action to private employers.